

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,263,279 to Fujii et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric resonator device which includes:

an insulating layer located between the ground electrode of the circuit substrate and the electrodes of the dielectric resonator so as to insulate the ground electrode from the electrodes; and

an insulative adhesive provided at one of the openings of the electrodes of the dielectric resonator for joining the dielectric resonator to the circuit substrate such that the electrode of the dielectric resonator facing the ground electrode of the circuit substrate is electrically insulated from the ground electrode of the circuit substrate.

Similarly, among the limitations of independent claim 6 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric resonator device which includes:

an insulating layer located between the ground electrode of the circuit substrate and one of the electrodes of the dielectric resonator; and

an insulative adhesive provided between the dielectric resonator and the circuit substrate for joining the dielectric resonator to the circuit substrate such that the electrode of the dielectric resonator facing the ground electrode of the circuit substrate is electrically insulated from the ground electrode of the circuit substrate.

Since the dielectric resonator and the circuit substrate are joined together with an insulative adhesive, the adhesion strength is greater than that of a conductive adhesive. Moreover, because an insulating layer is provided between the ground electrode of the circuit substrate and the electrodes of the dielectric resonator a current path remains unchanged the adhesive is partially

detached due to a difference in, for example, coefficient of linear expansion. See specification at page 3, line 14 to page 4, line 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* rejection. As admitted on page 2 of the Office Action, Fujii et al. does not teach or suggest the use of both an insulating layer and an insulative adhesive. The Office Action then simply concludes that it is well known to apply an insulating layer between two conductive parts and it is also known to use an insulative adhesive as a joining compound, without citing a reference to support this conclusion.

Applicant respectfully submits that it is not obvious to use both an insulating layer and an insulative adhesive in the manner set forth in independent claims 1 and 6. The general knowledge of one skilled in the art would not suggest this combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either cite a reference in support of this position or withdraw this rejection. MPEP § 2144.03.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Fujii et al. does not teach or suggest the insulating layer and the insulative adhesive required by independent claims 1 and 6. Specifically, in the oscillator of Fujii et al. the resonator 20 is held in place by a concave portion 31 provided in the case 30. The resonator 20 is not held in place by an adhesive, let alone by an insulative adhesive. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Fujii et al. fails to teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Claims 7-10 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 6 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims includes additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7-10 are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1 and 6, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-10 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: September 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Richard LaCava/

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant